



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,696	10/21/2003	Francois Cottard	06028.0028-00	9761
7590	11/10/2004			
Thomas L. Irving FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3315			EXAMINER ELHILO, EISA B	
			ART UNIT 1751	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/690,696

Applicant(s)

COTTARD ET AL.

Examiner

Eisa B Elhilo

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/21/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1751

Claims 1-56 are pending in this application.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent et al. (US 2002/0046431 A1) in view of Cotteret et al. (US 5,868,800).

Laurent et al. (US' 431 A1) teaches a hair dyeing composition comprising at least one oxidation dye (see page 1, paragraph, 0019) and cationic poly(vinyl lactam) polymers formed from a) monomers of vinyl lactam and monomers of alkyl vinyl lactam monomers, at least one monomer chosen from formulae (Ib) and (IIb) which are similar to the claimed formulae (Ia) and (Ib) as claimed in claims 1-2 and 5-8 (see page 6, paragraphs, 0155-0166 and page 7, paragraphs, 0167-0177), wherein the monomer is a compound having a formula (IVb) which is similar to the claimed formula (III) as claimed in claim 3 (see page 7, paragraphs, 0178-0183), wherein the monomer of formula (IVb) is vinyl pyrrolidone as claimed in claim 4 (see page, 7, paragraph, 0184), wherein the composition also comprises additional monomers chosen from cationic and nonionic monomers as claimed in claim 9 (see page 7, paragraph, 0185), wherein the composition further, comprises terpolymer having a) monomers (IVb), b) monomer (Ib) and c) monomer (IIb) wherein the monomers are identical to the claimed monomers as claimed in claim 10 (see page 7, paragraphs, 0186 -0187 and paragraphs 0188-0189), wherein the terpolymer

Art Unit: 1751

comprises by weight, 40 to 95% of monomer (a), 0.25 to 50% of monomer (b) and 0.1 to 55% of monomer (c) as claimed in claim 11 (see page 7, paragraph, 0190), wherein the cationic poly(vinylactams) is vinylpyrrolidone/dimethylamino-propylmethacrylamine/dodecyldimethylmethacrylamidopropylammonium tosylate as claimed in claim 12 (see page 7, paragraph, 0191), wherein the weight-average molecular mass of the cationic poly(vinylactams) ranges from 500 to 20 000 000, 200 000 to 2,000 000 or 400 000 to 800 000 as claimed in claims 13-15 (see page 7, paragraph, 0192), wherein the composition comprises at least one oxidation base of para-phenylenediamine in the amount of 0.0005 to 12% which is within the claimed range as claimed in claims 23-26 (see page 10, paragraph, 0266 and page 13, paragraph, 0312), couplers of meta-phenylenediamines in the amount of 0.0001 to 10% which is within the claimed range as claimed in claims 27-29 (see page 13, paragraphs, 0314 and 0315), hydrochlorides and hydrobromides as acid addition salts of oxidation bases as claimed in claim 30-31 (see page 13, paragraph, 0316), direct dyes as claimed in claim 32 (see page 13, paragraph, 0317), additional cationic amphoteric polymers having the formulae (W) and (U) which are identical to the claimed formulae (W) and (U) as claimed in claims 33-35 (see page 17, formulae (W) and (U)), at least one amphoteric polymer is a copolymer comprising as monomer at least acrylic acid and dimethyldiallylammonium salt as claimed in claim 36 (see page 27, claim 61), wherein the additional polymers present in the amounts of 0.01 to 10%, 0.05 to 5% and 0.1 to 3% as claimed in claims 37-39 (see page 17, paragraph, 0396), at least one surfactant chosen from cationic, anionic and amphiphilic surfactants and thickeners as claimed in claims 40 and 43 (see page 21, paragraph, 0466), at least one reducing agent in the amount of 0.05 to 3% as claimed in claim 44 (see page 21, paragraph, 0467), at least one oxidizing agent such as hydrogen peroxide in the

Art Unit: 1751

aqueous solution of 1-40 volumes as claimed in claims 45-48 (see page 21, paragraph, 0469), wherein the dyeing composition has a pH in the range of 6 to 11 which within the claimed range as claimed in claim 49 (see page 21, paragraph, 0471). Laurent et al. (US' 431 A1) also teaches a process for dyeing hair comprising applying to the hair the dyeing composition as described above and wherein the dyeing composition is mixed with the oxidizing composition before the application as claimed in claims 50-52 (see page 22, paragraph, 0477). Laurent et al. (US' 431 A1) further, teaches multi compartment devices for holding the dyeing composition as claimed in claims 53-54 (see page 27, claim 66). Laurent et al. (US' 431).

The disclosure of Laurent et al. (US' 431 A1) as described above, does not teach or disclose fatty acids chosen from C10-C14 fatty acids as claimed.

However, Laurent et al. teaches dyeing composition comprising other fatty acids such as oleic acid (see page 22, paragraph, 0493).

Cotteret et al. (US' 800) in analogous art teaches a hair dyeing formulation comprising fatty acids such as lauric acid in the amount of 3.5 g (3.5%) which within the claimed ranges as claimed in claims 18-21 (see col. 4, Example 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary in the art at the time the invention was made to formulate such a composition by incorporating the lauric acid as taught by Cotteret et al. in the dyeing composition of Laurent et al. to make such a composition because Laurent et al. as a primary reference suggests the use of fatty acids in the dyeing composition. Cotteret et al. as a secondary reference teaches clearly a composition comprising lauric acid as described above, and, thus a person of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to incorporate fatty acids in the hair dyeing composition including lauric acid as claimed with the

Art Unit: 1751

reasonable expectation of success for improving the performance of the dyeing composition and would expect such a composition would have similar properties to those claimed, absent unexpected results.

With respect to claims 16-17, 22 and 41-42, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to formulate such a composition by optimizing the amounts of the cationic polymers, fatty acids and surfactants in the dyeing composition with the reasonable expectation of success, because Laurent et al. teaches a dyeing composition comprising at least one cationic amphiphilic polymers in the amount of 0.01 to 3% by wt. (see page 26, claim 45), fatty acid such as oleic acid in the amount of 2% (see page 22, paragraph 0493) and effective amounts of at least one agent conventionally used in oxidation dyeing such as at least one adjuvant including surfactants (see page 21, paragraph, 0466), and, thus, a person of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to optimize the amounts of these dyeing ingredients in order to get the maximum effective amounts of these ingredients in the composition and would expect such a composition to have similar properties to those claimed, absent unexpected results.

With respect to claims 55-56, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a multi-compartment device comprising three compartments for holding and maintaining the dyeing composition because Laurent et al. clearly teaches a device or kit for dyeing hair comprising at least two compartments (see page 27, claim 66) which implies that more than two compartments may be used to hold and maintain the dyeing composition, and, thus, a person of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use

Art Unit: 1751

any number of compartments including those claimed and would expect such a device would be suitable for holding the dyeing ingredients as those claimed, absent unexpected results.


Conclusion

2 The references listed on from 1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (FR 2820032) and (EP 1179 336 A1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eisa B Elhilo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1315. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (8:00 -5:30) with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Eisa Elhilo
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1751

November 6, 2004

Application/Control Number: 10/690,696

Page 7

Art Unit: 1751